

LOCALLY PROJECTIVE MONOIDAL MODEL STRUCTURE FOR COMPLEXES OF QUASI-COHERENT SHEAVES ON $\mathbf{P}^1(\mathbf{k})$

E. ENOCHS, S. ESTRADA AND J.R. GARCÍA-ROZAS

ABSTRACT. We will generalize the projective model structure in the category of unbounded complexes of modules over a commutative ring to the category of unbounded complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves over the projective line. Concretely we will define a locally projective model structure in the category of complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves on the projective line. In this model structure the cofibrant objects are the dg-locally projective complexes. We also describe the fibrations of this model structure and show that the model structure is monoidal. We point out that this model structure is necessarily different from other known model structures such as the injective model structure and the locally free model structure.

1. INTRODUCTION

Quasi-coherent sheaves are known to play the role of modules in algebraic geometry. And even from a homological viewpoint they behave much like modules. For example the derived category of $R\text{-Mod}$, $\mathcal{D}(R)$ (here R is a commutative ring with identity) is well understood because there are several Quillen model structures on $\text{Ch}(R)$ (the category of unbounded complexes of R -modules) which allow one to define and compute the extension functors. These are the projective model structure and the injective model structure. It is known that the injective model structure is not suitable for studying the torsion functors since this structure, is not compatible with the graded tensor product of $\text{Ch}(R)$, induced from the tensor product of $R\text{-Mod}$. But the projective model structure is compatible with the tensor product (see [17, Chapter 4]) so it can be used to define the torsion functors. Furthermore it has been recently proved, by using the (positive) solution to the flat cover conjecture (cf. [3]), that there is an induced flat model structure which is compatible with the tensor product (see [13]).

Now let us consider the category $\mathfrak{Qco}(X)$ of quasi-coherent sheaves over a scheme X . It has been proved in [6] that this is a Grothendieck category, so hence we can apply a result due to Joyal (in [2]) that inherits an injective model structure which allows one to compute the derived extension functors in the category of quasi-coherent sheaves on any scheme. However there is a natural tensor product in $\mathfrak{Qco}(X)$, so it would be desirable to impose a model structure in $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(X))$ compatible with the tensor product of quasi-coherent sheaves. The main problem is that $\mathfrak{Qco}(X)$ does not have enough projectives, so the problem is of a different nature from that of the case of R -modules. In some circumstances the existence of a family of flat generators can be used to replace the projective ones. For example in [14] is proved that the category of unbounded complexes of sheaves of $\mathcal{O}$ -modules admits a flat model structure similar to that of $\text{Ch}(R)$ by using the fact that there are enough flat objects in the category of sheaves of modules on a commutative ring. But it is not known in general if the category of quasi-coherent sheaves on an arbitrary scheme admits a family of flat generators. In [6] a family is exhibited that makes $\mathfrak{Qco}(X)$ into a locally λ -presentable category, for λ a certain regular cardinal. But they are not flat in general. However for some nice schemes (which are in practise the most used for algebraic geometers) like quasi-compact and quasi-separated there are enough flat objects, so a modified version of the results of [14] together with the positive solution of the flat cover conjecture given in [6] allow one to impose a flat model structure in $\mathfrak{Qco}(X)$, at least in this case (X quasi-compact and quasi-separated).

Now let us fix our scheme X to be a closed immersion of the projective space $\mathbf{P}^n(k)$ (k is a field). Then there is a nice family of generators for $\mathfrak{Qco}(X)$ with finite projective dimension. We have the family of $\mathcal{O}(m)$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $\mathbf{P}^n(k)$. These give the family $\{i^*(\mathcal{O}(m)) : m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, where $i : X \hookrightarrow \mathbf{P}^n(k)$ (see [15, pg. 120] for notation and terminology) we will let $\mathcal{O}(m)$ denote $i^*(\mathcal{O}(m))$. Of course they are not projective but in some circumstances they behave like projective objects. For instance, for the case $n = 1$ a classic result of Grothendieck states that every finitely generated and free quasi-coherent sheaf decomposes as the direct sum of $\mathcal{O}(m)$'s. Our goal in this paper will be to show that this generators allow to get what we call a locally projective model structure in $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$ which is compatible with the closed symmetrical monoidal structure of $\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))$. This may be surprising at first since the class of locally projective quasi-coherent sheaves is contained strictly in the class of flat quasi-coherent sheaves and one could have the impression that for categories without enough projectives but with enough flat objects, the flat model structure would be the “smallest” one which is compatible with the tensor product of the category.

The main idea we use to get our result is a generalized version of Kaplansky's theorem (see [19, Theorem 1]) which states that every locally projective quasi-coherent sheaf on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$ is a direct transfinite extension of countably generated quasi-coherent sheaves (Theorem 4.4). Direct (and inverse) transfinite extensions are widely studied in [9].

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 3 we introduce the cotorsion pair cogenerated by the class of locally free generators when X is a scheme with enough locally frees. In Section 4 we particularize the previous situation to the scheme $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$ and we are able to prove that locally projective quasi-coherent sheaves appear in the left side of a cotorsion pair (Subsection 4.2). We also give a complete description of the right side of this cotorsion pair in Subsection 4.1. Section 5 is devoted to developing the tools we need in proving that we have an induced model structure in $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$. And finally in Section 6 we get the locally projective monoidal structure in $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$. We note that since the complete description given in Section 4 of the quasi-coherent sheaves involved in the cotorsion pair cogenerated by $\{\mathcal{O}(m) : m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ we are able to describe the fibrations and the cofibrations in the locally projective monoidal model structure. Thus we note that our model structure is necessarily different from that in [18, Theorem 2.4].

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we introduce all basic definitions we need along the paper. We recall from [9] the definition of a direct transfinite extension. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Grothendieck category. A direct system $(A_\alpha | \alpha \leq \lambda)$ is said to be continuous if $A_0 = 0$ and if for each limit ordinal $\beta \leq \lambda$ we have $A_\beta = \varinjlim_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha$ with the limit over the $\alpha < \beta$. The direct system $(A_\alpha | \alpha \leq \lambda)$ is said to be a system of monomorphisms if all the morphisms in the system are monomorphisms.

Definition 2.1. An object A of $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be a direct transfinite extension of objects of $\mathcal{L}$ (here $\mathcal{L}$ is a class of objects of $\mathcal{A}$ closed under isomorphisms) if $A = \varinjlim A_\alpha$ for a continuous direct system $(A_\alpha | \alpha \leq \lambda)$ of monomorphisms such that $\text{coker}(A_\alpha \rightarrow A_{\alpha+1})$ is in $\mathcal{L}$ whenever $\alpha + 1 \leq \lambda$. The class $\mathcal{L}$ is said to be closed under direct transfinite extensions if each direct transfinite extension of objects in $\mathcal{L}$ is also in $\mathcal{L}$.

Definition 2.2. Given a class $\mathcal{D}$ of objects of $\mathcal{A}$ then the class of objects Y of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\text{Ext}^1(D, Y) = 0$ for all $D \in \mathcal{D}$ is denoted $\mathcal{D}^\perp$. Similarly ${}^\perp\mathcal{D}$ denotes the class of Z such that $\text{Ext}^1(Z, D) = 0$ for all $D \in \mathcal{D}$.

Definition 2.3. A pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C})$ of classes of objects of $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be cotorsion pair if $\mathcal{F}^\perp = \mathcal{C}$ and if ${}^\perp\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{F}$. It is said to have enough injectives (resp. enough projectives) if for each Z of $\mathcal{A}$ there exists an exact sequence

$0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow C \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$ (resp. an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow C' \rightarrow F' \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$) where $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$ and where $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}$. The cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C})$ is said to be complete if it has enough injectives and projectives for each object of $\mathcal{A}$. We furthermore say that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C})$ is functorially complete if these sequences can be chosen in a functorial manner (depending on Y and on Z) (see Definition 2.3 of [16]).

We also recall from [11] the definition of a Kaplansky class.

Definition 2.4. A class $\mathcal{L}$ of objects of $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be a Kaplansky class of $\mathcal{A}$ if for each cardinal κ there is a cardinal λ such that if $S \subset L$ for some $L \in \mathcal{L}$ where $|S| \leq \kappa$ then there is an $L' \subset L$ with $S \subset L'$ where $|L'| \leq \lambda$ and where L' and L/L' are both in $\mathcal{L}$.

Now let X be a scheme. In [6] is described a category equivalent to the category $\mathfrak{Qco}(X)$ of quasi-coherent sheaves on X . If we let $\mathcal{T}$ to denote the collection of all affine open subsets, then we can define a quiver $Q = (V, E)$, where the vertices are the affine opens and there is an arrow $v \rightarrow w$ whenever $w \subset v$. Then we let R be a functor from Q to the category of commutative rings, given by $R(v) = \mathcal{O}_X(v)$, where $\mathcal{O}_X$ is the structure sheaf of X . Then the category of quasi-coherent R -modules (see [6, Section 2]) over Q is equivalent to the category of quasi-coherent sheaves on X .

Now if X is the projective line $X = \mathbf{P}^1(k)$ on a field k , we will give a explicit description of the quiver point of view of $\mathfrak{Qco}(X)$. The structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}$ of the scheme $\mathbf{P}^1(k) = (Proj\ k[x_0, x_1], \mathcal{O})$ may be identified with the representation

$$\mathcal{O} \equiv k[x] \hookrightarrow k[x, x^{-1}] \hookleftarrow k[x^{-1}]$$

of the quiver

$$Q \equiv \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \leftarrow \bullet,$$

by just making the change $x = x_1/x_0$. Then, a quasi-coherent sheaf of modules over $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$ is a representation

$$M \xrightarrow{f} P \xleftarrow{g} N$$

of Q with $M \in k[x]\text{-Mod}$, $N \in k[x^{-1}]\text{-Mod}$, $P \in k[x, x^{-1}]\text{-Mod}$, f an $k[x]$ -linear map and g an $k[x^{-1}]$ -linear map, satisfying that

$$S^{-1}f : S^{-1}M \rightarrow S^{-1}P \cong P$$

and

$$T^{-1}g : T^{-1}N \rightarrow T^{-1}P \cong P$$

are $k[x, x^{-1}]$ -isomorphisms, where $S = \{1, x, x^2, \dots\}$ and $T = \{1, x^{-1}, x^{-2}, \dots\}$. It is easy to see that kernels and cokernels in these categories of representations of Q with those relations can be computed componentwise.

3. THE LOCALLY FREE COTORSION PAIR IN $\mathfrak{Qco}(S)$

Theorem 3.1. *Let S be a noetherian scheme with enough locally frees. Let us denote by $\mathcal{U}$ the set of all locally free generators. Then the pair $({}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp), \mathcal{U}^\perp)$ is a complete cotorsion pair. Furthermore every $X \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp)$ is a locally projective quasi-coherent sheaf on S .*

Proof. It is clear that $({}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp), \mathcal{U}^\perp)$ is a cotorsion pair. Let us see that it is a complete cotorsion pair. By [4, Lemma 1] it follows that ${}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp)$ contains all direct transfinite extensions of the locally frees $S \in \mathcal{U}$. Furthermore by [4] (the arguments there are for modules but easily carry over to our setting) for all $M \in \mathfrak{Qco}(X)$ there exists a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$$

where $Y \in \mathcal{U}^\perp$ and Z a direct transfinite extension of $S \in \mathcal{U}$ (so $Z \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp)$ by the previous). This shows that the cotorsion pair $({}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp), \mathcal{U}^\perp)$ has enough injectives. To show that it has enough projectives we mimic the Salce trick (see [21, Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3]). Given any $M \in \mathfrak{Qco}(X)$, since X has enough locally frees there exists a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow V \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

where V is a direct sum of $S \in \mathcal{U}$. Now let

$$0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$$

be exact with $Y \in \mathcal{U}^\perp$ and Z a direct transfinite extension of $S \in \mathcal{U}$. Form a pushout and get

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & U & \longrightarrow & V & \longrightarrow & M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow id_M \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & W & \longrightarrow & M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & Z & \xrightarrow{id_Z} & Z & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & \end{array}$$

Then since V is a direct sum of $S \in \mathcal{U}$ and since Z is a direct transfinite extension of $S \in \mathcal{U}$ we see that W is a direct transfinite extension of locally frees. Also $Y \in \mathcal{U}^\perp$. Hence if $M \in {}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp)$ we get that $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow W \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ splits and so M is a direct summand of a direct transfinite extension of S 's. But then it follows that, for every vertex v , $M(v)$ is a direct summand of a transfinite extension of projective modules $S(v)$'s, so by [1, Proposition 3] M is a locally projective quasi-coherent sheaf. $\square$

Remark 3.2. In the next sections we exhibit a case where the converse of the previous result is also true, that is ${}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp)$ consists precisely of locally projective quasi-coherent sheaves.

4. LOCALLY PROJECTIVE QUASI-COHERENT SHEAVES ON $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$

Henceforth we let our scheme to be the projective line on a field k . In this case we will prove that the model structure induced by the complete cotorsion pair $({}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp), \mathcal{U}^\perp)$ is the generalization of the usual projective model structure on $\text{Ch}(R)$ (for R any commutative ring) (see [17, Section 2.3]). We hope the methods of the next sections will apply to more general schemes to give more information about we can call “the locally projective model structure” on $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$.

We will start by describing the elements of the class $\mathcal{U}^\perp$.

4.1. Computation of $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}(n), M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N)$.

Let us take $M \xrightarrow{\sigma} P \xleftarrow{\tau} N$. We use the Baer description of Ext^1 . Given a short exact sequence

$$(4.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow (M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B) \rightarrow (k[x] \hookrightarrow k[x, x^{-1}] \hookleftarrow k[x^{-1}]) \rightarrow 0$$

we know that $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow A \rightarrow k[x] \rightarrow 0$ is exact. So it is split exact. So we can let $A = M \oplus k[x]$ and assume

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow M \oplus k[x] \rightarrow k[x] \rightarrow 0$$

is the obvious exact sequence. Likewise we can take $C = P \oplus k[x, x^{-1}]$ and $B = N \oplus k[x^{-1}]$.

So

$$(A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B) = M \oplus k[x] \rightarrow P \oplus k[x, x^{-1}] \leftarrow N \oplus k[x^{-1}].$$

By the exact sequence (4.1) we see that the map

$$M \oplus k[x] \rightarrow P \oplus k[x, x^{-1}]$$

is completely determined by a map $k[x] \rightarrow P$, that is, that given $y \in P$, if we consider the map

$$(m, p(x)) \mapsto (\sigma(m) + p(x) y, p(x))$$

from $M \oplus k[x]$ to $P \oplus k[x, x^{-1}]$ then if we localize at $S = \{1, x, x^2, \dots\}$ then we get that

$$S^{-1}((M \oplus k[x]) \rightarrow (P \oplus k[x, x^{-1}]))$$

an isomorphism. This is because $S^{-1}(M \rightarrow P)$ and $S^{-1}(k[x] \hookrightarrow k[x, x^{-1}])$ are both isomorphisms, the exactness of $S^{-1}(\cdot)$ and the snake lemma.

So using any $y \in P$ we get a commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & P \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ M \oplus k[x] & \longrightarrow & P \oplus k[x, x^{-1}] \end{array}$$

Similarly given a $z \in P$ we get a commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xleftarrow{\tau} & N \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ P \oplus k[x, x^{-1}] & \xleftarrow{\quad} & N \oplus k[x^{-1}] \end{array}$$

where the bottom map is $(n, q(x^{-1})) \mapsto (\tau(n) + q(x^{-1})z, q(x^{-1}))$.

So all the above gives.

Proposition 4.1. *Any extension of $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}(0), M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N)$ is completely determined by arbitrary $y, z \in P$.*

Using the same sort of reasoning we can see that a section for

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow (M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N) &\rightarrow (M \oplus k[x] \rightarrow P \oplus k[x, x^{-1}] \leftarrow N \oplus k[x^{-1}]) \\ &\rightarrow (k[x] \hookrightarrow k[x, x^{-1}] \hookleftarrow k[x^{-1}]) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

(where the central term is determined by a $u \in M, v \in N$) so $k[x] \rightarrow M \oplus k[x]$ maps 1 to $(u, 1)$ and $k[x^{-1}] \rightarrow N \oplus k[x^{-1}]$ maps 1 to $(v, 1)$. Here the conditions on u, v in order that we have a morphism

$$(k[x] \hookrightarrow k[x, x^{-1}] \hookleftarrow k[x^{-1}]) \rightarrow (M \oplus k[x] \rightarrow P \oplus k[x, x^{-1}] \leftarrow N \oplus k[x^{-1}])$$

are that $\sigma(u) + y = \tau(v) + z$, or that $\sigma(u) - \tau(v) = z - y$. Note that since $k[x] \cap k[x^{-1}] = k$ this condition is all that is needed in order to have a morphism. Since $y, z \in P$ are arbitrary, $z - y$ can be any element of P . So we have proved the following.

Proposition 4.2. $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}(0), M \xrightarrow{\sigma} P \xleftarrow{\tau} N) = 0$ if, and only if, $P = \sigma(M) + \tau(N)$. In fact

$$\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}(0), M \xrightarrow{\sigma} P \xleftarrow{\tau} N) \cong P/(\sigma(M) + \tau(N))$$

Using the same type argument we can get.

Proposition 4.3. For any integer n ,

$$\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}(n), M \xrightarrow{\sigma} P \xleftarrow{\tau} N) \cong P/(x^n \sigma(M) + \tau(N))$$

so $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}(n), M \xrightarrow{\sigma} P \xleftarrow{\tau} N) = 0$ if, and only if, $x^n \sigma(M) + \tau(N) = P$.

4.2. The class ${}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp)$ coincides with the class of locally projectives.

Let us denote by $\mathcal{P}$ the class of all locally projective quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$. So $(M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N) \in \mathcal{P}$ if and only if M, P and N are projective $k[x], k[x, x^{-1}]$ and $k[x^{-1}]$ -modules respectively. By Theorem 3.1 we already know that ${}^\perp(\mathcal{U}^\perp) \subseteq \mathcal{P}$. We prove now that the converse is also true. We note that this Theorem is a generalization of a Kaplansky's theorem ([19, Theorem 1]) for quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$.

Theorem 4.4. Any locally projective $(M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N) \in \mathcal{P}$ is a direct transfinite extension of countably generated locally projective quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$.

Proof. Since $M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N$ is a quasi-coherent sheaf on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$ then $P \cong S^{-1}M \cong T^{-1}N$ with $S = \{1, x, x^2, \dots\}$, $T = \{1, x^{-1}, x^{-2}, \dots\}$. Suppose that M and N are projective. By [19] $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ and $N = \bigoplus_{j \in J} N_j$ with each M_i and N_j countably generated.

Let $I' \subset I$ be any countable subset. Then it is clear that

$$S^{-1}(\bigoplus_{i \in I'} M_i) \subset T^{-1}(\bigoplus_{j \in J'} N_j)$$

for some countable subset $J' \subset J$. Then let $I' \subset I'' \subset I$, I'' countable be such that

$$S^{-1}(\bigoplus_{i \in I''} M_i) \supset T^{-1}(\bigoplus_{j \in J'} N_j).$$

Then continuing this zig-zag procedure we construct

$$I' \subset I'' \subset I''' \subset \dots \subset I$$

$$J' \subset J'' \subset J''' \subset \dots \subset J$$

with each of $I', I'', \dots, J', J'', \dots$ countable and satisfying the obvious conditions. Then if $\bar{I} = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} I^{(n)}$, $\bar{J} = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} J^{(n)}$ we get $S^{-1}(\bigoplus_{i \in \bar{I}} M_i) = T^{-1}(\bigoplus_{j \in \bar{J}} N_j)$ i.e. we have the subrepresentation

$$\bigoplus_{i \in \bar{I}} M_i \rightarrow S^{-1}(\bigoplus_{i \in \bar{I}} M_i) = T^{-1}(\bigoplus_{j \in \bar{J}} N_j)$$

with $\bigoplus_{i \in \bar{I}} M_i$ and $(\bigoplus_{j \in \bar{J}} N_j)$ countably generated projective modules. Notice that the quotient of the original $M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N$ by this subrepresentation is isomorphic to a representation

$$\bigoplus_{i \in I - \bar{I}} M_i \rightarrow U \leftarrow \bigoplus_{j \in J - \bar{J}} N_j.$$

We repeat the procedure with this representation and see that we can find $\bar{I} \subset \bar{\bar{I}} \subset I$, $\bar{J} \subset \bar{\bar{J}} \subset J$, $\bar{\bar{I}}, \bar{\bar{J}}$ countable, with $S^{-1}(\bigoplus_{i \in \bar{\bar{I}}} M_i) = T^{-1}(\bigoplus_{j \in \bar{\bar{J}}} N_j)$ but where $\bar{\bar{J}}$ contains any given countable subset of $J - \bar{J}$. So we continue this procedure and see that we can write $I = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} I_\alpha$, $J = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} J_\alpha$ as continuous unions of subsets (λ some

ordinal number) such that $S^{-1}(\oplus_{i \in I_\alpha} M_i) = T^{-1}(\oplus_{j \in J_\alpha} N_j)$ for each α and such that if $\alpha + 1 < \lambda$ then $I_{\alpha+1} - I_\alpha$ and $J_{\alpha+1} - J_\alpha$ are countable. $\square$

Remark 4.5. If a module is a direct transfinite extension of countably generated projective modules, then it is a direct sum of countably generated projective modules and conversely. But in the sheaf situation above we do not get such a direct sum.

Theorem 4.6. *Every countably generated and locally free quasi-coherent sheaf on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$ is a direct transfinite extension of $\mathcal{O}(n)$'s.*

Proof. Let $M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N$ be such that M and N are free with given countable bases. Then, as usual, we can assume $M \xrightarrow{id} P \leftarrow N$ (see for example [8]). So $M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N$ will be given by an infinite matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_{11} & p_{12} & \cdots \\ p_{21} & \cdots & \\ \vdots & & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$$

where the columns correspond to the image of the base elements of N . Hence we have a column finite matrix. As usual we can assume that the matrix is in upper triangular form i.e. is equal to

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_{11} & p_{12} & p_{13} & \cdots \\ 0 & p_{22} & p_{23} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & p_{33} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$$

This matrix corresponds to an automorphism of $k[x, x^{-1}] \oplus k[x, x^{-1}] \oplus \cdots$ so has an inverse (also column finite). So we get that in fact each p_{ii} is a unit of $k[x, x^{-1}]$ (we need that the inverse matrix is also upper triangular). So we can assume $p_{ii} = x^{n_i}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Then we see that $M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N$ has $\mathcal{O}(n_1)$ as a subrepresentation (generated by the first base elements of M and N) and that the quotient of $M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N$ by this $\mathcal{O}(n_1)$ has $\mathcal{O}(n_2)$ as a subrepresentation, etc. So we see that $M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N$ is in fact a direct transfinite extension with the corresponding quotients equal to the $\mathcal{O}(n_1), \mathcal{O}(n_2), \dots$'s. Hence $M \rightarrow P \leftarrow N$ is a direct transfinite extension of $\mathcal{O}(n)$'s. $\square$

Combining Theorems 4.4 and 4.6 we get

Corollary 4.7. *Any locally projective sheaf is the direct transfinite extension of $\mathcal{O}(n)$'s.*

Remark 4.8. It seems unlikely that we can get any kind of uniqueness result or even that any such sheaf is a direct sum of $\mathcal{O}(n)$'s. So this result supports the claim that it is worthwhile studying transfinite extensions.

5. COMPLETE COTORSION PAIRS IN $\text{Ch}(\mathbf{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$

We devote the next two sections to proving that the class of locally projective quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$ induces a Quillen's model structure in the category $\text{Ch}(\mathbf{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$ of unbounded complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$.

This will be done by applying Hovey's criteria (see [16, Theorem 2.2]) relating cotorsion pairs with model categories structures. We need to recall some standard definitions concerning to complexes. Most of them can found in [12]. We let (M, δ) or simply M to denote a complex

$$\cdots \rightarrow M^{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} M^0 \xrightarrow{\delta^0} M^1 \xrightarrow{\delta^1} \cdots$$

If M is a complex we let $Z(M) = \cdots \rightarrow Z_n M \rightarrow Z_{n+1} M \rightarrow \cdots$ and $B(M) = \cdots \rightarrow B_n M \rightarrow B_{n+1} M \rightarrow \cdots$ be the subcomplexes of cycles and boundaries of M .

For a given quasi-coherent sheaf M we let $\underline{M}[n]$ the complex with M in the $-n$ th place and 0 in other places ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$). We denote by $\overline{M}[n]$ the complex $\cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{id} M \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots$ where the M in the $-n-1$ and $-n$ th position ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$).

If (M, δ_M) and (N, δ_N) are two chain complexes we define $Hom(M, N)$ to be the complex

$$\cdots \rightarrow \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} Hom(M^k, N^{k+n}) \xrightarrow{\delta^n} \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} Hom(M^k, N^{k+n+1}) \rightarrow \cdots,$$

where $(\delta^n f)^k = \delta_N^{k+n} f^k - (-1)^n f^{k+1} \delta_M^k$. Then we define $Ext_{Ch(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))}(M, N)$ to be the group of equivalence classes of short exact sequences of complexes $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$. We note that $Ch(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$ is a Grothendieck category having the set $\mathcal{I} = \{\underline{\mathcal{O}}(m)[n] : m, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ as a family of generators. So Ext^i , $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ functors can be computed by using injective resolutions.

We recall from [13] the following definitions: an exact complex E of quasi-coherent sheaves is said to be an $\mathcal{U}^\perp$ complex if E is exact and $Z_n E \in \mathcal{U}^\perp$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We let $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp$ to denote the class of all $\mathcal{U}^\perp$ complexes. Then a complex M of quasi-coherent sheaves is said to be dg-locally projective if $Hom(M, E)$ is an exact complex for any complex $E \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp$. We let $dg\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ to denote the class of all dg-locally projective quasi-coherent sheaves.

There are the corresponding dual definitions of the previous classes. So we get the classes $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and $dg\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp$ of locally projective complexes and dg- $\mathcal{U}^\perp$ complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves respectively.

As we said we will apply [16, Theorem 2.2] to get our locally projective model structure. The adapted version of the conditions of that theorem to our setting is the following:

- (1) The pairs $(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}, dg\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ and $(dg\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ are cotorsion pairs,
- (2) Exact dg-locally projective complexes in $Ch(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$ are locally projective, that is, $dg\widetilde{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{E} = \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ where $\mathcal{E}$ is the class of all exact complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$.
- (3) The pairs $(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}, dg\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ and $(dg\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ are complete.

So let us prove each one of the previous conditions. Before that, we need to make more accurate the statements made in [13, Lemma 3.8(7),(8)].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian category and $Ch(\mathcal{A})$ its corresponding category of unbounded complexes. Let M, N be any complexes of $Ch(\mathcal{A})$ and C any object of $\mathcal{A}$. Then there exist monomorphisms of abelian groups*

$$0 \rightarrow Ext_{\mathcal{A}}^1(C, Z_n N) \rightarrow Ext_{Ch(\mathcal{A})}^1(\underline{C}[-n], N)$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow Ext_{\mathcal{A}}^1(M_n/B_n M, C) \rightarrow Ext_{Ch(\mathcal{A})}^1(M, \underline{C}[-n])$$

Proof. Let us see the first claim. Let $0 \rightarrow Z_n N \rightarrow T \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be any extension of $Ext_{\mathcal{A}}^1(C, Z_n N)$. Then we form the pushout of the inclusion $Z_n N \rightarrow N_n$ and $Z_n \rightarrow T$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & 0 & & 0 & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & Z_n N & \longrightarrow & T & \longrightarrow & C \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
0 & \longrightarrow & N_n & \xrightarrow{g} & Q & \longrightarrow & C \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow h & & \\
& & B_{n+1} N & \xlongequal{\quad} & B_{n+1} N & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & 0 & & 0 & &
\end{array}$$

Then we have the commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & N_{n-1} & \xlongequal{\quad} & N_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow \delta^{n-1} & & \downarrow g \circ \delta^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & N_n & \xrightarrow{g} & Q & \xrightarrow{t} & C \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow \delta^n & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & N_{n+1} & \xlongequal{\quad} & N_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \longrightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

Hence we have an extension $\xi = 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow H \rightarrow \underline{C}[-n] \rightarrow 0$ in $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})}^1(\underline{C}[-n], N)$. This defines a map from

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(C, Z_n N) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})}^1(\underline{C}[-n], N).$$

It is clear that the map is going to be a morphism of abelian groups with respect to the Baer sum of extensions. Now if ξ splits and $r : C \rightarrow Q$ is the corresponding excision in the n th component of ξ , we follow by the commutativity of the diagram that $h \circ r = 0$, so $\text{Im}(r) \subseteq T$. Hence $0 \rightarrow Z_n N \rightarrow T \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ splits. The proof of the second monomorphism is dual. $\square$

Remark 5.2. Monomorphisms of Lemma 5.1 are not isomorphisms in general. For if we consider the category $\text{Ch}(R)$ of unbounded complexes of R -modules (here R is any ring with identity) then if P is any projective R -module $\text{Ext}_R^1(P, -) = 0$, but $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}(R)}^1(\underline{P}[-n], -) \neq 0$ because $\underline{P}[-n]$ is a dg-projective complex, but is not projective. The same holds for the second monomorphism by taking C any injective R -module. We also point out that if $\mathcal{A}$ has enough injectives then we have the cotorsion pair

$$(\text{exact complexes}, \text{dg-injectives})$$

and hence it is easy to get the isomorphism

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(Z_{n+1} M, C) \cong \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})}^1(M, \underline{C}[-n]),$$

for every exact complex M . Dually if $\mathcal{A}$ has enough projectives then we get the cotorsion pair

$$(\text{dg} - \text{projectives}, \text{exact complexes})$$

and therefore if N is exact we have the isomorphism $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(C, Z_n N) \cong \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})}^1(\underline{C}[-n], N)$.

Proposition 5.3. *The pairs $(\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}, \text{dg}\widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ and $(\text{dg}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ are cotorsion pairs,*

Proof. Since $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{U}^\perp)$ is a cotorsion pair and $\mathcal{P}$ contains a family of locally projective generators for $\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))$ the result follows from [13, Proposition 3.6] (with the remark that the part of the proof of [13, Proposition 3.6] involving [13, Lemma 3.8(7),(8)] can be replaced by Lemma 5.1). $\square$

Proposition 5.4. *$\text{dg}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{E} = \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ where $\mathcal{E}$ is the class of all exact complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.10 of [13] it only remains to prove that $\text{dg}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{E} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$. By the results of [15, Section II.5] there exists right adjoint of the restriction functor $i^*[x] : \mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)) \rightarrow k[x]\text{-Mod}$ given by $i^*(M_1 \rightarrow M \leftarrow M_2) = M_1$. This is defined as $i_*[x](N) = (N \hookrightarrow S^{-1}N \xleftarrow{id} S^{-1}N)$, for every $k[x]$ -module N . And there are an analogous pair of adjoint functors

$$(i^*[x^{-1}], i_*[x^{-1}])$$

and $(i^*[x, x^{-1}], i_*[x, x^{-1}])$.

Now let $Y = Y_1 \rightarrow Y_0 \leftarrow Y_2$ be a complex in $\text{dg}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{E}$ (so Y_1, Y_0 and Y_2 are complexes of $k[x], k[x^{-1}]$ and $k[x, x^{-1}]$ modules respectively). To see that Y is in $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ we have to check that $Z_n Y$ is a locally projective quasi-coherent sheaf, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, that is $Z_n Y_1, Z_n Y_0$ and $Z_n Y_2$ are projective $k[x], k[x^{-1}]$ and $k[x, x^{-1}]$ modules respectively. By [12, Proposition 2.3.7] if a complex of modules (over $k[x], k[x^{-1}]$ or $k[x, x^{-1}]$) is exact and dg-projective then it is projective (so, in particular, $Z_n Y_1, Z_n Y_0$ and $Z_n Y_2$ will be projective modules). So we will be done if we show that Y_1, Y_0 and Y_2 are exact and dg-projective complexes of $k[x], k[x^{-1}]$ and $k[x, x^{-1}]$ modules, respectively. We will do so for Y_1 . The other cases are similar. So let us assume that

$$Y_1 = \cdots \rightarrow M^{-1} \rightarrow M^0 \rightarrow M^1 \rightarrow \cdots,$$

with $M^i \in k[x]\text{-Mod}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since Y is an exact complex of quasi-coherent sheaves $Y_1 = i^*[x](Y)$ will be also exact. We see that is dg-projective. So let E be an exact complex of $k[x]$ -modules. We have to check that $\text{Hom}_{\text{Ch}(k[x])}(Y_1, E)$ is exact. But, by the previous comments, there is an isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Ch}(k[x])}(Y_1, E) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Ch}(k[x])}(i^*[x](Y), E) \cong \text{Hom}_{\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))}(Y, i_*[x](E))$$

and since the functor $i_*[x]$ preserves exactness, $i_*[x](E)$ will be an exact complex of quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$. Since $Y \in \text{dg}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ if we show that $i_*[x](E) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp$ we will be done. To see this we need to check that $Z_n i_*[x](E) \in \mathcal{U}^\perp$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}$. But $Z_n i_*[x](E) = i_*[x](Z_n E)$. Hence

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))}^1(\mathcal{O}(m), i_*[x](Z_n E)) \cong \text{Ext}_{k[x]}^1(i^*[x](\mathcal{O}(m)), Z_n E) = 0$$

(where the last equality follows because $i^*[x](\mathcal{O}(m)) = k[x]$). $\square$

To get that $(\text{dg}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ is a complete cotorsion pair we need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5. *Let Y be a complex in $\text{dg}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$. Then Y is a direct summand of a direct transfinite extension of $\mathcal{O}(n)[m]$'s.*

Proof. We will prove that the cotorsion pair $(dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ is cogenerated by the set $\mathcal{I} = \{\underline{\mathcal{O}}(k)[m] : k, m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Then the result will follow reasoning as we did in the proof of Theorem 3.1. It is easy to check that $\mathcal{I} \subseteq dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ for if $\underline{\mathcal{O}}(k)[m]_l \in \mathcal{P}, \forall l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for every exact complex $M \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp$, $\text{Hom}(\underline{\mathcal{O}}(k)[m], M)$ is the complex

$$\cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(k), M^l) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(k), M^{l+1}) \rightarrow \cdots$$

which is obviously exact because $Z_n M, B_n M \in \mathcal{U}^\perp$. So therefore $\mathcal{I}^\perp \supseteq (dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}})^\perp = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp$. We now prove the converse: let $N \in \mathcal{I}^\perp$. We have to see that N is exact and that $Z_n N \in \mathcal{U}^\perp$. We prove that N is exact. It is clear that this is equivalent to that each morphism $\underline{\mathcal{O}}(m)[n] \rightarrow N$ can be extended to $\overline{\mathcal{O}}(m)[n] \rightarrow N$, for every $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. But this follows from the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{O}}(m)[n] \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{O}}(m)[n] \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{O}}(m)[n+1] \rightarrow 0$$

and since $\text{Ext}^1(\underline{\mathcal{O}}(m)[n+1], N) = 0$. Let us see the last claim. Since $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathcal{O}(m) : m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ cogenerates the cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{U}^\perp)$ we only need to prove that $\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))}^1(\mathcal{O}(m), Z_n N) = 0, \forall m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Lemma 5.1 we have a monomorphism of abelian groups

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))}^1(\mathcal{O}(m), Z_n N) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))}^1(\underline{\mathcal{O}}(m)[-n], N)$$

and since the last is equal to 0 we get that $Z_n N \in \mathcal{U}^\perp$. $\square$

Proposition 5.6. *The cotorsion pair $(dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ of complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$ is complete.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.5 the pair $(dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ is a cotorsion pair cogenerated by a set and $dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ contains a family of generators of $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$. Then by [7, Theorem 2.6] we get that $(dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ is a complete cotorsion pair. $\square$

Corollary 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the class of exact complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp = dg\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp \cap \mathcal{E}$.*

Proof. By propositions 5.3 and 5.6 the pair $(dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ is a cotorsion pair with enough injectives. By Proposition 5.4, $dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{E} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$, so by [13, Lemma 3.14 (a)] we get that we claim. $\square$

We finish this section by proving that $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, dg\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ is also complete. We need the following Lemma.

Lemma 5.8. *The class $\mathcal{P}$ of all locally projective quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$ is a Kaplansky class.*

Proof. Let $P \in \mathcal{P}$ be a locally projective quasi-coherent sheaf. By Theorem 4.4 we can write $P = \varinjlim_{\alpha < \lambda} S_\alpha$, with $\{S_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ a direct transfinite system of countable generated quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$. Let $\aleph \geq \omega, |k|$ be a regular cardinal and let $0 \neq X \subseteq P$ where $|X| \leq \aleph$. For every element $x \in X$ let us pick $j_x < \lambda$ such that $x \in S_{j_x}$. Let γ be the supremum of such $j_x, x \in X$ and let us take $S = \varinjlim_{\beta < \gamma} S_\beta$. It is clear that $|S| \leq \aleph$ and that $S \in \mathcal{P}$. Let us see that $P/S \in \mathcal{P}$. Since direct limits in $\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))$ are computed componentwise, if we call $S = S_1 \rightarrow S_0 \leftarrow S_2$ and $P = P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \leftarrow P_2$, we get that $S_1 = \varinjlim_{\beta \leq \gamma} S_\beta^1$ (where $S_\beta = S_\beta^1 \rightarrow S_\beta^0 \leftarrow S_\beta^2$) and P_1 are direct transfinite extensions of countably generated projective $k[x]$ -modules, so hence direct sums of countably generated projective $k[x]$ -modules and S_1 is a direct summand of P_1 . Therefore P_1/S_1 will be a projective $k[x]$ -module. The same reasoning applies to P_0/S_0 and P_2/S_2 to get that P/S is a locally projective quasi-coherent sheaf. $\square$

Theorem 5.9. *The cotorsion pair $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, dg\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ is complete.*

Proof. We will make the proof in several steps. First we will use Lemma 5.8 to see that the pair $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, dg\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ is cogenerated by a set. Then we appeal to [7, Theorem 2.6] to get that the cotorsion pair is complete (note that the set $\{\underline{\mathcal{O}}(k)[m] : k, m \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ also cogenerates $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$). To see that the pair $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, dg\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ is cogenerated by a set we need to show the following: let P be any exact complex in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$, $x \in P$ and let us fix a

regular cardinal $\aleph \geq \omega, |k|$. We will prove that there exists an exact subcomplex L of F such that $L, F/L \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and $|L| \leq \aleph$. Since the class $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is closed under extensions and direct limits the previous says that we can write every complex in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ as the direct union of a continuous chain of subcomplexes in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ with cardinality less than or equal to $\aleph$. Then if T is a set of representatives of complexes L in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ with $|L| \leq \aleph$, we get by [4, Lemma 1] that the pair $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}, dg\tilde{\mathcal{U}}^\perp)$ is cogenerated by a set.

So let us start with the proof. We fix some notation: let us denote by $G = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}(n)$ the generator of $\Omega\mathbf{co}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))$. For a given $x \in F^i$ there exists a certain $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a map $\mathcal{O}(m) \rightarrow F^i$ sending 1 to x . we use the notation Gx to denote the image of map $\mathcal{O}(m) \hookrightarrow G \rightarrow F^i$. Let us suppose (without loss of generality) that $k = 0$ and $x \in F^0$. Consider then the exact complex

$$(S1) \quad \cdots \rightarrow A_1^{-2} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-2}} A_1^{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} Gx \xrightarrow{\delta^0} \delta^0(Gx) \xrightarrow{\delta^1} 0$$

where A_1^{-i} is a quasi-coherent subsheaf of F^{-i} constructed as follows: $|Gx| \leq \aleph$ since $|G| \leq \aleph$, so we can find $A_1^{-1} \leq F^{-1}$ such that $|A_1^{-1}| \leq \aleph$ and $\delta^{-1}(A_1^{-1}) = \ker(\delta^0|_{Rx})$. Then $A_1^{-2} \leq F^{-2}$, $|A_1^{-2}| \leq \aleph$, and $\delta^{-2}(A_1^{-2}) = \ker(\delta^{-1}|_{A_1^{-1}})$, and we repeat the argument.

Now $\ker(\delta^0|_{Gx}) \leq \ker \delta^0$, so we know by Lemma 5.8 that $\ker(\delta^0|_{Gx})$ can be embedded into a locally projective quasi-coherent subsheaf S_2^0 of $\ker \delta^0$. Since $|\ker(\delta^0|_{Gx})| \leq \aleph$ we see by Lemma 5.8 that S_2^0 can be chosen in such a way that $|S_2^0| \leq \aleph$. Then consider the exact complex

$$(S2) \quad \cdots \rightarrow A_2^{-2} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-2}} A_2^{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} Gx + S_2^0 \xrightarrow{\delta^0} \delta^0(Gx) \xrightarrow{\delta^1} 0$$

where A_2^{-i} are taken as above. It is clear that $\ker(\delta^0|_{Gx+S_2^0}) = S_2^0$, which is a locally projective quasi-coherent subsheaf of $\ker \delta^0$, and that $|Gx + S_2^0| \leq \aleph + \aleph = \aleph$.

Observe now that $\delta^0(Gx) \subseteq \ker \delta^1$, so we can embed $\delta^0(Gx)$ into a locally projective quasi-coherent subsheaf S_3^1 of $\ker \delta^1$ in such a way that $|S_3^1| \leq \aleph$ ($|\delta^0(Gx)| \leq \aleph$), and then take the exact complex

$$(S3) \quad \cdots \rightarrow A_3^{-2} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-2}} A_3^{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} A_3^0 \xrightarrow{\delta^0} S_3^1 \xrightarrow{\delta^1} 0.$$

We see again that $\ker(\delta|_{S_3^1}) = S_3^1$, which is a quasi-coherent subsheaf of $\ker \delta^1$ in $\mathcal{P}$.

We turn over and find $S_4^0 \leq \ker \delta^0$ locally projective with $|S_4^0| \leq \aleph$ and $S_4^0 \supseteq \ker(\delta^0|_{A_3^0})$, and then construct $A_4^{-i} \leq F^{-i}$ ($|A_4^{-i}| \leq \aleph \forall i$) such that

$$(S4) \quad \cdots \rightarrow A_4^{-2} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-2}} A_4^{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} A_3^0 + S_4^0 \xrightarrow{\delta^0} S_3^1 \xrightarrow{\delta^1} 0$$

is exact. Once more $\ker(\delta^0|_{A_3^0+S_4^0}) = S_4^0 \leq \ker \delta^0$ is a locally projective quasi-coherent subsheaf. Then find $S_5^{-1} \leq \ker \delta^{-1}$ locally projective with $|S_5^{-1}| \leq \aleph$, $\ker(\delta^{-1}|_{A_4^{-1}}) \subseteq S_5^{-1}$, and consider the exact complex

$$(S5) \quad \cdots \rightarrow A_5^{-2} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-2}} A_4^{-1} + S_5^{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} A_3^0 + S_4^0 \xrightarrow{\delta^0} S_3^1 \xrightarrow{\delta^1} 0,$$

in which $\ker(\delta^{-1}|_{A_4^{-1}+S_5^{-1}}) = S_5^{-1} \leq \ker \delta^{-1}$ pure.

The next step is to find $S_6^{-2} \leq \ker \delta^{-2}$ locally projective such that $|S_6^{-2}| \leq \aleph$ and that $\ker(\delta^{-2}|_{A_5^{-2}}) \subseteq S_6^{-2}$, and then consider the exact complex

$$(S6) \quad \cdots \rightarrow A_6^{-3} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-3}} A_5^{-2} + S_6^{-2} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-2}} A_4^{-1} + S_5^{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} A_3^0 + S_4^0 \xrightarrow{\delta^0} S_3^1 \xrightarrow{\delta^1} 0$$

in which $\ker(\delta^{-2}|_{A_5^{-2}+S_6^{-2}}) = S_6^{-2} \subseteq \ker \delta^{-2}$ locally projective.

Therefore we prove by induction that for any $n \geq 4$ we can construct an exact complex

$$(Sn) \quad \cdots \xrightarrow{\delta^{-n+2}} A_n^{-n+3} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-n+3}} T_n^{-n+4} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-n+4}} T_n^{-n+5} \rightarrow \cdots \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} T_n^0 \xrightarrow{\delta^0} T_n^1 \xrightarrow{\delta^1} 0$$

such that $\ker(\delta^{-n+j}|_{T_n^{-n+j}})$ is a locally projective quasi-coherent subsheaf of $\ker \delta^{-n+j} \forall j \geq 4$ and that all the terms have cardinality less than or equal to $\aleph$.

If we take the direct limit $L = \varinjlim (Sn)$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we see that the complex L is exact and $\ker(\delta^i|_{L^i})$ is a locally projective quasi-coherent subsheaf of $\ker \delta^i \forall i \leq 1$. Furthermore $|L^i| \leq \aleph_0 \cdot \aleph = \aleph$ for any $i \leq 1$, so $|L| \leq \aleph$. We finally consider the complex L to be

$$L = \cdots \rightarrow L^i \xrightarrow{\delta^i} L^{i+1} \xrightarrow{\delta^{i+1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} L^0 \xrightarrow{\delta^0} L^1 \xrightarrow{\delta^1} 0 \xrightarrow{\delta^2} 0 \cdots,$$

which is a subcomplex of F , $x \in L^0$, and $\ker(\delta^i|_{L^i})$ is a locally projective quasi-coherent subsheaf of $\ker \delta^i \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and so $\ker(\delta^i|_{L^i})$. Therefore the complex L is a subcomplex in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ of F and of course $|L| \leq \aleph$.

To finish the proof we only have to argue that $F/L = (F^i/L^i, \bar{\delta}^i)$ is in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. An easy computation shows that $\ker \bar{\delta}^i = \ker(\delta^i)/\ker(\delta^i|_{L^i})$, but by construction $\ker(\delta^i|_{L^i})$ is a locally projective quasi-coherent subsheaf of $\ker \delta^i \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$, so $\ker(\delta^i)/\ker(\delta^i|_{L^i})$ is locally projective for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Of course F/L is exact since both F and L are exact, so F/L is in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. $\square$

6. THE MONOIDAL LOCALLY PROJECTIVE MODEL STRUCTURE ON $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$

With the results of the previous section, we are in position to impose a locally projective model structure on $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$.

Theorem 6.1. *There is a model structure in $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$ such that $dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is the class of cofibrant objects, $dg\mathcal{U}^\perp$ is the class of fibrant objects and the exact complexes are the trivial objects.*

Proof. This follows from [16, Theorem 2.2] taking $\mathcal{C} = dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$, $\mathcal{F} = dg\mathcal{U}^\perp$ and $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{E}$, the class of all exact complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves. $\square$

Now we will prove that the previous model structure is compatible with the graded tensor product on $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$. We recall that for a given two complexes of quasi-coherent sheaves M and N , the tensor product $M \otimes N$ is a complex of abelian groups with $(M \otimes N)_m = \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} M_t \otimes_{\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))} N_{m-t}$ and

$$\delta = \delta_M^t \otimes id_N + (-1)^t id_M \otimes \delta_N^{m-t},$$

for all $m, t \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The previous tensor product becomes $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$ into a monoidal category. To see that the structure is closed we appeal to the natural embedding $\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^1(k)}\text{-Mod}$, where $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^1(k)}\text{-Mod}$ is the category of sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^1(k)}$ -modules. Since this embedding preserves direct limits, it will have a right adjoint functor $Q : \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^1(k)}\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))$. This functor Q allows to show that $\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))$ is a closed symmetric monoidal category (the closed structure is given by applying Q after the internal Hom functor of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^1(k)}\text{-Mod}$). This structure extends to $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$ becoming it into a closed symmetric monoidal category

As it is pointed in [18, pg. 9] it would be desirable to get a model structure in the category $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$ compatible with the closed symmetric monoidal structure (in the sense of [17, Chapter 4]). Our locally projective model structure certainly is (Theorem 6.2). We remark that for the case where X is a quasi-compact and quasi-separated scheme the category $\mathfrak{Qco}(X)$ has enough flat objects, so by using the results of [6], a modified argument to that of [13] allows one to impose a flat model structure in $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(X))$ which will be compatible with the tensor product. However, since quasi-coherent sheaves play the role of the modules in categories of sheaves and is known that there exists a monoidal projective model structure in $\text{Ch}(R)$ (whenever R is any commutative ring) it seems natural to conjecture that there is analogous locally projective monoidal model structure for quasi-coherent sheaves, at least for sufficiently nice schemes (closed subschemes of $\mathbf{P}^m(k)$). So our result is a first step in addressing this problem.

Theorem 6.2. *The induced model structure on $\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$ by the cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{U}^\perp)$ is compatible with the graded tensor product given above.*

Proof. Let us check that the conditions of [16, Theorem 7.2] holds in this situation. Notice that using the notation of that Theorem in our situation $\mathcal{P}$ is the class of all short exact sequences and $\mathcal{W}$ the class of exact complexes. So we will check that

- i) Every monomorphism of complexes with cokernel a dg-locally projective complex is a pure injection in each degree.
- ii) If X and Y are dg-locally projective complexes then $X \otimes Y$ is also dg-locally projective.
- iii) If X, Y are dg-locally projective complexes and Y is exact then $X \otimes Y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$.
- iv) The complex with the direct sum of $\mathcal{O}(m)$'s in one component and 0 in the rest is dg-locally projective.

Conditions i) and iv) follows immediately from the definitions (since a dg-locally projective complex is a flat quasi-coherent sheaf componentwise). So let us see condition ii). By Lemma 5.5 it suffices to prove the statement for $\underline{\mathcal{O}(m)}[n]$, $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. But in this case we have

$$\underline{\mathcal{O}(m)}[n_1] \otimes \underline{\mathcal{O}(m')}[n_2] \cong \underline{\mathcal{O}(m+m')}[n_1+n_2]$$

so is again of this form. Finally let us check condition iii). By ii), $X \otimes Y$ is in $dg\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and since Y is exact $X \otimes Y$ will be also exact. But then by Proposition 5.4 we get that $X \otimes Y \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. $\square$

7. DERIVED EXTENSION FUNCTORS BY USING LOCALLY PROJECTIVE RESOLUTIONS

We finish the paper by applying the previous monoidal locally projective model structure to get an alternate way of computing right derived functors of quasi-coherent sheaves on $\mathbf{P}^1(k)$ by using locally projective resolutions of quasi-coherent sheaves.

Derived extension functors can be defined from a Quillen's model structure on

$$\text{Ch}(\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k)))$$

from the equation

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))}^n(M, N) = \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))}(Q_M, R_N) / \sim$$

where Q_M is a cofibrant replacement of $\underline{M}$ and R_N is a cofibrant replacement of $\underline{N}[n]$. Now in [13, Lemma 5.3] is shown that a cofibrant replacement of $\underline{M}$ is the deleted complex $\mathbf{P}_\bullet$ of an exact complex $\cdots \rightarrow P_2 \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ where P_n are locally projective quasi-coherent sheaves and each cycle quasi-coherent sheaf is in $\mathcal{U}^\perp$. Dually the deleted complex $\mathbf{U}^\bullet$ of an exact complex $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow U_0 \rightarrow U_1 \rightarrow \cdots$ where U_n is in $\mathcal{U}^\perp$ and each cycle is locally projective, is a fibrant replacement of $\underline{N}$.

Now noting that

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))}(\mathbf{P}_\bullet, \mathbf{U}^\bullet[n]) / \sim = H^n(\text{Hom}(\mathbf{P}_\bullet, \mathbf{U}^\bullet))$$

we follow that derived extension functors of quasi-coherent sheaves can be computed as the homology of the Hom -complex:

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{Qco}(\mathbf{P}^1(k))}^n(M, N) = H^n(\text{Hom}(\mathbf{P}_\bullet, \mathbf{U}^\bullet))$$

where $\mathbf{P}_\bullet = \cdots \rightarrow P_2 \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbf{U}^\bullet = 0 \rightarrow U_0 \rightarrow U_1 \rightarrow U_2 \rightarrow \cdots$ are the corresponding deleted complexes of M and N .

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Auslander. *On the dimension of modules and algebras (III)*, Global dimension, Nagoya Math. J. **9** (1955), 67-77.
- [2] T. Beke. *Sheafifiable homotopy model categories*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **129**(3) (2000), 447-475.
- [3] L. Bican, R. El Bashir and E. Enochs. *All Modules have flat covers*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **33**(4) (2001), 385-390.
- [4] P.C. Eklof and J. Trlifaj. *How to make Ext vanish*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **33**(1) (2001), 41-51.
- [5] E. Enochs. *Injective and flat covers, envelopes and resolvents*, Israel J. Math. **39** (1981), 189-209.
- [6] E. Enochs and S. Estrada. *Relative homological algebra in the category of quasi-coherent sheaves*. Adv. in Math. **194**, (2005) 284-295.
- [7] E. Enochs, S. Estrada, J.R. García Rozas and L. Oyonarte. *Flat covers in the category of quasi-coherent sheaves over the projective line*, Comm. Algebra. **32** (2004), 1497-1508.
- [8] E. Enochs, S. Estrada and B. Torrecillas. *An elementary proof of Grothendieck's Theorem*, Abelian groups, rings, modules and homological algebra, vol. 249, Chapman & Hall. (2006), 67-75.
- [9] E. Enochs, O.M.G. Jenda and A. Iacob. *Closure under transfinite extensions*, to appear in Illinois J. Math.
- [10] E. Enochs and O.M.G. Jenda. *Relative homological algebra*, De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, vol. 30, Walter De Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 2000.
- [11] E. Enochs and J.A. López Ramos. *Kaplansky classes*. Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova. **107**, (2002) 67-79
- [12] J.R. García Rozas. *Covers and envelopes in the category of complexes of modules*, Research Notes in Mathematics, vol. 407, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, Florida, 1999.
- [13] J. Gillespie. *The flat model structure on $Ch(R)$* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **356**(8) (2004), 3369-3390.
- [14] J. Gillespie. *The flat model structure on complexes of sheaves*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **358**(8) (2006), 2855-2874.
- [15] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **52**, Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- [16] M. Hovey. *Cotorsion pairs, model category structures, and representation theory*, Math. Z. **241**, (2002) 553-592.
- [17] M. Hovey. *Model Categories*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 63, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.
- [18] M. Hovey. *Model category structures on chain complexes of sheaves*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353**(6) (2001), 2441-2457.
- [19] I. Kaplansky. *Projective modules*, Ann. Math. **68**(2) (1958), 372-377.
- [20] D.G. Quillen. *Homotopical algebra*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 43, Springer-Verlag, 1967.
- [21] L. Salce. *Cotorsion theories for abelian groups*, Symposia Mathematica, Vol. 23 (1979), 11-32.
- [22] B. Stenström. *Rings of quotients*. Springer-Verlag, 1975.
- [23] J. Xu. *Flat covers of modules*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 1634, Springer-Verlag, 1996.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506-0027, U.S.A.
E-mail address: enochs@ms.uky.edu

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA, UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA, CAMPUS DEL ESPINARDO, ESPINARDO (MURCIA) 30100, SPAIN
E-mail address: sestrada@um.es

DEPARTAMENTO DE ÁLGEBRA Y A. MATEMÁTICO, UNIVERSIDAD DE ALMERÍA, ALMERÍA 04071, SPAIN
E-mail address: jrgrozas@ual.es